REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-9 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-9 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (Applicant's description of related art disclosure) in view of Dibiashi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0171869). Claim 10 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 as being in an improper form, specifically, it must name other claims in the alternative only.

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 10 without disclaimer. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 11-29 have been added.

§112 rejection

1. Claims 1-9 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 lacks an antecedent basis for the limitation "communication equipment" in line 9. Claim 7 also lacks an antecedent basis for the limitation "apparatuses" in line 5. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to correct these informalities. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§103 rejection

2. Claims 1-9 are also currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (Applicant's description of related art disclosure) in view of Dibiashi

et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0171869). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "temporary storage means for temporarily storing the image data sent from the imaging apparatus." The Examiner argues that Applicant's admitted prior art teaches all the aspects of claim 1 of the present invention in the specification, with the exception of the temporary storage means for temporarily storing the image data sent from the imaging apparatus, and wherein the wireless communication equipment is connected via a wired communication line to a printing system for carrying out printing processing on the image data. The Examiner avers that Dibiashi teaches the use of a file transfer system to a temporary storage means, which is then transferred to a printing facility.

Applicants disagree with this interpretation of the Dibiashi reference. The temporary storage means that the Examiner refers to in the Dibiashi reference is the library database. However, the Dibiashi reference does not state, nor is it inherent, that the information in the library database is stored only temporarily. The only description of the library database is that it communicates with the creation unit, the file transfer system, and the processing unit, and that a library of components, e.g., graphic elements, text elements, layout elements, style elements, etc., may be defined and stored within it. Information is then read from the record data, and the proper library data is pulled from the library database and sent to the printing facility. Because the contents of the library database appear to include the basic elements for formatted outputs, the contents of these basic elements cannot be categorized as temporary, as the Examiner argues. The temporary storage feature does not appear to be shown in the Dibiashi reference.

Further, in a non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, the temporary memory is utilized for coordinating the difference in communication speed between wired and wireless communications, while the memory in Dibiashi is simply a storage device.

Additionally, the Examiner's stated motivation for combining the references is to increase storage capacity and bandwidth. This is contradictory to the stated purpose of Dibiashi, which is to decrease the storage and bandwidth requirements. With regard to the reduced bandwidth requirements, Dibiashi would likely introduce the delays (11 Mbps to 1 Mbps) that the present invention seeks to obviate. Accordingly, the combination is not supportable. In the removal of a relatively minor portion of the disclosure by Dibiashi and the attempted placement of such in the present invention, the Examiner appears to be improperly using hindsight to construct the current invention, using the current invention as a roadmap. Claim 1 should be patentable as amended.

Claims 2-10 should be patentable at least from their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 11-29 are added to describe features of the invention more particularly.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Perng Pan
Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 9, 2006